IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NO: 12692 of 2005

Between:

A. Jeevan Reddy, S/o. Linga Reddy,
R/o. Narsapur, Dilawarpur Mandal,

Adilabad District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation,

Musheerabad, Hyderabad,
Rep. by its Vice Chairman & Managing Director.

2. The Chairman, APSRTC, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an order direction or writ particularly one in the nature of Writ Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ declaring the proceedings of the respondent No.Ec/118(8)/2001-PD.1 dated 22-04-2002 and the consequential proceedings No. Ec/118(8)/2001-PPD.1 dated 29-5-2002 imposing the penalty of deferment of annual increment for a period of two years which will have the effect of postponing the future increments, treating the period of suspension is not on duty is illegal, arbitrary; and consequently set aside the same and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.G.VIDYASAGAR

Counsel for the Respondent: SMT.P.RAJANI REDDY, Standing Counsel for APSRTC

The Court at the stage of admission made the following:

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the impugned order passed by the first respondent i.e., Vice Chairman and Managing Director imposing the penalty of deferment of annual increment for a period of two years which will have the effect of postponing the future increments.

2. According to the petitioner, disciplinary proceedings were initiated for certain alleged irregularities and on 29-05-2002, the impugned order was passed by the Vice Chairman, after conducting necessary enquiry and relying upon the enquiry report. Against which, an appeal was filed as early as on 19-07-2002 with the board. However, the grievance of the petitioner is that no orders have been passed disposing of the appeal, so far. Therefore, the petitioner is constrained to approach this Court assailing the proceeding itself.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is disposed of directing the appellate authority-second respondent to dispose of the appeal of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

_____

S.ANANDA REDDY, J

16th June, 2005

SKM

To

1 The Vice Chairman & Managing Director.

Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation,

Musheerabad, Hyderabad,
2 The Chairman, APSRTC, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

3 Two CD copies